



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/440,442	11/15/1999	ARI V. KRISH	M-8038US	2954

33031 7590 03/08/2005

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP  
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.  
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
----------

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/440,442

Applicant(s)

KRISH, ARI V.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2157

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on October 19, 2004. Claims 6-7, and 31-32 were canceled. Claims 10-30 are pending

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne, U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712 (referred to hereafter as Du).

Du teaches the invention as claimed including a system and method for processing HTML documents using nested tags (see abstract).

As to claim 10, Du teaches a method for processing requests from a computer network, said method comprising:

connecting a computer to the computer network (see fig. 1);

receiving a data stream from the computer network (see col. 3, lines 1-40, Du discloses that the server intercepts the URL data stream response);

identifying a template within the data stream (see col. 4, lines 1-10, Du discloses that tags within the response data stream point to templates for specific applications);

searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate application database

corresponding to the template (see col. 8, lines 1-67, Du discloses that an appropriate database is accessed to fill in the template);

writing a web page resulting from the template; and sending the web page to the computer network (see col. 8, lines 20-43).

Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a "department logic". Du does teach that a specific application database is accessed in response to identifying the template (see col. 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Du by specifying the specific application database as a department logic since the same functionality of accessing a particular web site is achieved.

As to claim 11, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

determining a character set, the character set including the character set used by a requesting computer sending the data stream to the computer system (see col. 6, lines 60-65, Du discloses that text attributes are identified).

As to claim 12, Du teaches the method of claim 10.

Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of opening a socket, wherein the receiving and the sending is through the socket; and closing the socket.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of opening transmitting/receiving and closing a socket is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Du by specifying a socket connection. One would be motivated to do so to create a virtual connection between processes.

As to claim 13, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

creating a processing thread to process the data stream (see col. 18, lines 10-15).

As to claim 14, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:

decoding the data stream, the decoding including decrypting the data stream (see col. 9-10; col. 18-19).

As to claim 15, Du teaches the 15. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 10 further comprising:

decoding a uniform resource locator, the uniform resource locator included in the data

stream and identifying a server computer system in the computer network (see col. 18-19).

As to claim 16, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:  
determining a character set, the determining including identifying the character set  
used by a requesting computer in creating the data stream (see col. 6, lines 60-65, Du discloses that text attributes of the browser are identified).

As to claim 17, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:  
processing a header contained within the data stream, the processing including:  
evaluating a security token included in the header, the security token created during a prior session by a user, to determine whether the session is valid; and creating a new security token, the new security token used to validate subsequent sessions by the user (see col. 17-19, Du discloses that the session state between server and client is preserved through the implementation of tags).

As to claim 18, Du teaches the method of claim 10.

Du fails to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of a "department logic". Du does teach that a specific CGI script associated with a application database is accessed in response to identifying the template (see col. 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Du by specifying the specific application database as a department logic since the same functionality of accessing a particular web site is achieved.

As to claim 19, Du teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising:  
identifying a template within the data stream (see col. 8-12).

Claim 20 does not teach or define any new limitations above claims 10-19 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 21, Du teaches the method of claim 19 further comprising:  
parsing the template into one or more operators, tags, and banners (see col. 18-19).

Claims 22-27 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 10-21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Art Unit: 2157

4. Claims 29-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to teach neither singly or in combination the claimed limitation of a means for identifying the language code of a user terminal and a means for converting one or more bytes from the data stream into a uniform language code; and means for storing the uniform language code as in claims 28-30.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (571)272-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saleh Najjar', with a stylized, flowing script.

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157